DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 750 SO 035 070

AUTHOR Crocco, Margaret Smith

TITLE Dealing with Difference in the Social Studies: A Historical Perspective.

PUB DATE 2003-04-24

NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).

PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Differences; Educational Change; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnicity; Gender Issues; Race; *Social Studies

IDENTIFIERS Historical Research

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the question of how diversity has been dealt with in the 20th century since the formal inauguration of social studies as part of the U.S. public school curriculum. Given space constraints, the many historical reasons for change in the treatment of diversity is outlined in the paper in broad terms. Likewise, the larger subject of diversity within the social studies curriculum is limited to three dimensions: (1) race; (2) ethnicity; and (3) gender. The paper points out that defining difference in these categories is a strategy designed to focus on several concerns pertinent to the field today. However, this approach could also be employed in looking at other facets of difference in social studies curriculum, such as religion or class. It notes that the social studies emerged during the period 1890-1920, during which nativist and racist reactions to the challenges of emancipated slaves, alien newcomers, and unsettled gender relations were all deeply implicated in refashioning the educational enterprise. The paper attempts to articulate how the social studies curriculum has responded to the press of cultural, racial, and gender differences since the birth of the field. It also invites other researchers to test the hypotheses offered in future considerations of this subject. (Contains 72 notes.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Dealing with Difference in the Social Studies: A Historical Perspective.

Margaret Smith Crocco

ED 478 750

SO 035 070

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.S. Crocco

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent

"Dealing with Difference in the Social Studies: A Historical Perspective"

Margaret Smith Crocco
Teachers College, Columbia University

Paper prepared for AERA 2003, Chicago, Illinois

This essay will address the question of how difference has been dealt with by the social studies curriculum since its formal inauguration as part of the curriculum of American schooling early in the twentieth century. Given space constraints, the many historical reasons for change in the treatment of difference will be sketched out only in the broadest strokes. Likewise, the large subject of difference within the social studies curriculum will be limited to three dimensions: race, ethnicity, and gender. Defining difference in this fashion is a strategy designed to focus on several concerns pertinent to the field today, but this approach could also be employed in looking at other facets of difference in social studies curriculum, such as religion or class.[1]

Over the last hundred years, few other topics have been as important as difference in defining how Americans interpret citizenship education, the hallmark of social studies, and how they view what is educationally worthwhile.[2] Social studies emerged during the period 1890-1920, during which nativist and racist reactions to the challenges of emancipated slaves, alien newcomers, and unsettled gender relations were all deeply implicated in refashioning the educational enterprise. This paper attempts to articulate how social studies curriculum has responded to the press of cultural, racial, and gender differences since the birth of the field. It is also an invitation to other researchers to test the hypotheses offered here in future considerations of this subject.

In examining the history of the social studies, Michael Lybarger suggested that we ask: "What counted as social studies knowledge? Whose knowledge was this? What forms of social action did this knowledge legitimate, and what forms did it proscribe?"[3] These questions suggest several things: the normative nature, social legitimation, situatedness, and various consequences of curriculum. Indeed, Jeffrey Mirel has called schools "a major battleground in the struggle to define national identity and good citizenship."[4] To the extent that this statement accurately

describes relationships among schooling, social studies, and cultural ethos, this investigation of how social studies has dealt with difference provides a barometer of our shifting views on American national identity. But before embarking on the discussion of this history, a few definitions, caveats, and comments on methodology are in order.

In considering curriculum, I draw on Arthur Applebee's definition. Applebee sees curriculum as "conversation" between teacher and learner as well as between past and present. In other words, curriculum is an educational tradition providing a set of "culturally constituted tools for understanding and reforming the world."[5] This view has several advantages for my analysis since it situates curriculum in cultural and historical context, highlights the role of curriculum agents, including teachers, textbooks writers, and academic specialists, views the process of curriculum creation as a set of transactions among these parties as well as between teachers and learners, and aligns with a vision of schooling as a "critical mediating institution" between families and the twentieth century's rapidly changing social order.[6] In this article, as in previous works, I argue that considerations of positionality are pertinent to the analysis of curriculum history: who taught, who led, who learned, and who wrote authoritative works in the field constitute differences that can make a difference to the practice of social studies.[7]

Three eras with distinctive modes for dealing with difference will be discussed: 1910-1940: the cultural amelioration phase; 1945-1975: the psychological compensation phase; and 1990 to the present: the knowledge transformation phase. Among the factors important in shaping the approach to difference are: the social and political climate of a particular era, shifts in views concerning the purposes of education, and evolving understandings of the nature and aims of social studies. All factors carry weight across all phases, but the prominence of each factor may differ according to time period.

I recognize that social studies cannot be taken as a unitary phenomenon for purposes of investigation and matters of practice stand apart from exhortations and prescriptions around curriculum. The "field," such as it exists in any real sense beyond a heuristic one, can readily be

seen to be operating at any moment on a variety of fronts: most obviously, in schools, as enacted by teachers and students in classrooms; in textbooks and other curriculum materials designed for social studies instruction at the Kindergarten through Grade 12 level; by means of official pronouncements and publications dispensed by authoritative sources such as the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), teacher educators, educational scholars, state and local departments of education; and finally, in the articulation of social studies with those academic disciplines to which it is related, typically understood as history, geography, and the social sciences. The "action," if you will, of social studies curriculum change takes place on a variety of fronts—some more central to the official loci of power in the field, NCSS and prominent educational theorists in the early days, than others—but all ultimately bearing importance to shaping a field with as amorphous boundaries and as many practitioners and theorists as this one.[8]

In an article written in 1983 Ivor Goodson laid out three hypotheses about the development of curriculum: 1) school subjects are not monolithic entities but shifting amalgamations of sub-groups and traditions, which will have an effect on the boundaries and priorities of subjects; 2) school subjects tend to move from promoting pedagogic and utilitarian emphases towards more academic ones; and 3) conflicts over school subjects involve status, resources, and territory.[9] As organic entities within the dynamic world of schooling, curriculum fields are subject to many masters, especially so in a field as socially sensitive as the social studies. The least obvious of these three propositions is the second one, which I would apply to the social studies in this manner: During the twentieth century, the social studies has moved from an innovative and utilitarian emphasis on promoting citizenship a greater emphasis on traditional disciplinary knowledge, the reasons for which have as much to do with general educational trends in the United States as they do with the evolution of the field itself.

In terms of historical method, I have examined the traditional secondary sources within social studies historiography[10] as well as other historical evidence drawn from individuals and organizations operating "outside" of "mainstream" social studies, materials associated, for

example, with historically black colleges and universities and intercultural organizations that connect to social studies but which have not been viewed as central to its development by past historical accounts. I attend to several domains of activity: publications by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and by prominent curriculum theorists; textbooks written for use in social studies classrooms; and intellectual trends in the academic disciplines that feed the social studies. What gets left out are descriptions of the effects of social studies teachers' roles as "curricular-instructional gatekeepers" in applying curriculum ideas related to difference to their classrooms.[11] What also gets left out are educational reports by the federal government, an entity whose effects on schooling have increased recently, but whose influence was less prominent in most of the decades under discussion here.

The diverse nature of the evidence reflects my belief that change occurs as a result of multiple pressure points on curriculum, part of which gets exerted over time from the margins to the center. For example, new topics, such as gay and lesbian history, may eventually appear within school curriculum, but they will probably do so only after a lag time of perhaps thirty years after they gain academic legitimacy. When new material appears in curriculum, it arrives in a sanitized fashion, reflecting the politics of school textbook adoption.[12] Furthermore, even when educational theorists, curriculum writers, and textbooks authors legitimate new approaches, altered curriculum prescriptions rarely displace all vestiges of the older ways of treating a subject.[13] Despite the slow pace of change, however, we should accord significance to the altered prescriptions for practice documented in this article. Bearing in mind the conservative nature of most educational professional organizations and their members, finding recommendations for change in print, if not practice, is noteworthy.

If we take seriously Applebee's formulation of curriculum as a tradition of discourse that helps students make sense of their world, the questions of whether/how social studies deals with difference, who gets included in curriculum and on what terms, and who speaks authoritatively about subject matter are all differences that make a difference to citizenship education and to the

civic polity. Analyzing the history of dealing with difference in the social studies will illuminate how we have conceptualized the fundamental epistemological and normative underpinnings that lie at the heart of this school subject.

The Cultural Amelioration Phase, 1910-1940

The early twentieth century has often been described as a period of cultural assimilation or Americanization of "new" immigrants—groups from southern and eastern Europe, who were seen as posing greater challenges to incorporation into the body politic than the "old" immigrants from northern and western Europe.[14] Calling this early period the "cultural amelioration phase" highlights the efforts of progressive educators[15] to school new immigrants and change their old ways for their "own good."[16] Social studies education, in particular, was designed to remediate cultural deficiency and create better citizens out of those some feared were not suitable raw material for this democracy. Education would provide these groups with an entry point into a society viewed in the early twentieth century as representing the apex of the evolutionary ladder of all cultures worldwide.[17]

During this era, educational theorists often interpreted outsiders' deficiencies in terms of biological causes. Nevertheless, progressive educators placed faith in the power of schooling to eradicate the effects of those differences. In giving curriculum form to these aspirations, prominent educational leaders turned to Thomas Jesse Jones, a man with several degrees from Columbia University, including a bachelor's of divinity from Union Theological Seminary and M.A. and Ph.D. from Teachers College and Columbia University, respectively. His doctoral dissertation in the new field of educational sociology addressed issues of adjustment within immigrant communities to living in New York City. He made his early mark at Hampton Institute in Virginia, in part by developing a course called "social studies," which aimed at introducing the habits and virtues of citizenship to the African American and Native American students there.[18] Jones believed education would bring these groups closer to what he labeled somewhat later the "essentials of civilization."[19] Jones interpreted racial (what we would call today "ethnic")

differences as stemming from physical, mental, and social inheritances. He believed that concentrated doses of moral and character education could provide antidotes to the "impulsiveness" and favoring of "belief and superstition over knowledge" within these groups. [20]

Jones chaired the Committee on Social Studies in 1912, the year in which he also became specialist in Negro education at the U.S. Bureau of Education. In 1913, Jones was appointed Education Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, a philanthropic organization devoted to improving the situation of Blacks in the United States and Africa. On the Committee in Social Studies were several other individuals educated by Franklin Giddings, a sociologist steeped in the perspective of Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner, both of whom had applied evolutionary ideas to social systems. Although Jones spoke of the backwardness of the Black race, he also wrote about its great possibilities for improvement. Education in general and social studies in particular, with its promulgation of solid work habits, grounding in the principles of democratic government, devotion to community, and development of independent character would provide the impetus for creating sound citizenship. The views promulgated by the Committee on Social Studies reflected those later enunciated in the 1918 Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education "manifesto" issued by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The Cardinal Principles identified seven objectives for secondary education: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.[21]

Over the next thirty years as Jones's national reputation grew, his educational program for African Americans put him at odds with Black leaders like W.E.B. Dubois and Carter G. Woodson.[22] Jones's race-based views of culture, paternalistic treatment of Blacks, and support for industrial education proved anathema to Black intellectuals after Booker T. Washington. Many of these leaders rejected assimilation and espoused cultural pluralism, arguing for the robust nature of Black culture rather than its cultural deficiencies or cultural pathologies.[23]

Even as early as 1915, alternative voices to Jones's perspective could be heard, the most prominent of which was Horace Kallen, who challenged the notion of the melting pot as a useful model for American identity.[24] A number of women social educators of this period, such as Lucy Salmon, Jane Addams, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, and Mary Beard, took positions on cultural difference that were not nearly as rigidly hierarchical as the dominant view within social studies.[25] These women were also far more attuned to gender and its legitimate place in social education than were many prominent theorists of the day. Some, like Salmon and Addams, spurned marriage and lived in life-long partnerships with other women in colleges or social settlements. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg has described the "female world of love and ritual" often found in such settings.[26] Such institutions provided a haven for certain individuals from the tumultuous gender relations of the day, a period during which the ideology of masculinity often stood in the way of truly companionate marriage.[27] A few textbooks at that time included aspects of women's history and the accomplishments of women's organizations such as settlement houses. As early as the teens and twenties, Charles and Mary Beard's textbooks, among the most popular of their day, included discussion of the rights denied women.[28] By 1937, discussion of sex was also included in at least a few textbooks, alongside other "controversial topics" such as evolution, socialism, and pacifism.[29]

It would not be until the end of this period, however, that anthropology, as practiced by Franz Boas, Elsie Clews Parsons, Ruth Benedict, and Melville Herskovits would give scientific cachet to the concept of cultural relativism, which eventually supplanted genetically-based notions of difference with environmental ones. Gradually, their ideas gained greater acceptance among intellectuals and finally, in the second half of the century, among Americans more generally.[30]

Curriculum materials during this period, except for those produced by Black historians such as Carter G. Woodson, Charles Wesley, and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, either ignored Black Americans or perpetuated stereotypes that were clearly racist in

orientation. During the Red Scare of the 1920s, ethnic organizations such as the Steuben Society of America, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the NAACP, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith challenged negative representations of their group's members, and all put pressure on publishers to make changes to their publications.[31] Still, racist representations in textbooks lingered for years.[32]

The Psychological Compensation Phase, 1945-1975

Between 1945 and 1975, expanding engagement with difference in the social studies contrasts with later inclusion of similar content because of the prominence of psychologically oriented language used to justify inclusion of this material in the curriculum. The early part of this period has often been described in terms of the life adjustment movement in education. This label suggests the psychological orientation within education as "child-centered" rhetoric gained in popularity. In truth, the life adjustment goals were not terribly dissimilar from those of social efficiency during an earlier era—one of which was fitting students into their pegs in society. Race, ethnicity, and gender, of course, played a large role in determining the fit. Little talk about George Count's proposal to use schools to reconstruct the social order persisted into this era; instead, the goal could be defined as accommodation of students to society, which gave an interesting twist to the views enunciated by Rugg and Shumaker in 1928 under the label, "child-centered" schooling.[33]

As this period developed, concerns over the purportedly weak nature of the "ego identities" of minority groups led to fresh demands for infusion of cultural pluralism into the curriculum. By 1969, the following statement published in the NCSS journal, *Social Education*, suggests the rationale behind such ideas: "The cry for courses in Black history and culture has arisen in a new black push for an invigorated collective ego-identity or group self-respect and self-direction."[34]

The profound effects on American society of the Second World War and the Cold War include resurgence in the civil rights movement, which stimulated a rebirth of the women's

movement. With their husbands and sons off fighting the war, many women had their first experience of the satisfactions derived from doing stimulating work and living independently. Despite admonitions from policymakers and pundits for Black Americans to be patient and for women to return to their kitchens once the war ended, both groups demanded fuller participation in American society.

Legal challenges to segregation and workforce inequities by the NAACP and the National Urban League gained momentum in the forties and fifties as worldwide effort to fight fascism, Nazism, and later, Communism, put a spotlight on the distance between American rhetoric about democracy and its practice at home. In many respects, both women and African Americans shared optimism that the gains they had achieved during the war would not be rolled back in the aftermath of victory.[35] Publication in 1944 of Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*[36] had a significant impact on education as well as other domains.[37] In the years following, new educational initiatives focused on democratic citizenship education such as the Foxfire rural education movement in Tennessee, associated with Myles Horton, and establishment of Mississippi freedom schools in the early sixties empowering Black students to transform society reflected ongoing concerns about the failed promise of democracy in American education.[38]

Black scholars worked throughout these decades to bring educational recognition for the contributions of African Americans to American life. The *Negro History Bulletin*, Black History Month, the *Journal of Negro History* and *Journal of Negro Education* all highlighted Black educational accomplishments, aspirations, and critique of American society. Black scholars such as Edna Colson of Virginia State University, Marion Thompson Wright of Howard University, Merl Epps of Tennessee State University, and Doxey Wilkerson of Virginia State and Howard Universities took seriously the nation's rhetoric concerning democracy and citizenship and looked to social education to embody these principles.[39]

This period produced "dramatic development" in how minority groups were depicted: "The old stereotypes fell into disuse,"[40] although new approaches scarcely drove out racist or sexist depictions universally.[41] Over the course of these thirty years, significant changes occurred in social studies materials, with an explosion of material reflecting greater respect for cultural, gender, and racial difference than earlier in the century. By the end of the period, not only did textbooks devote more pages to social history and to minorities and women but also the tone was less patronizing than it had been earlier.[42] Still, these changes proceeded unevenly with many curriculum materials reflecting insignificant or token levels of engagement with matters of difference. During the early years of this phase, right-wing individuals were quite effective in denouncing "unpatriotic" and "dangerous" textbooks such as the works of Harold Rugg as the country fought the Cold War at home and abroad.[43] Just as George Counts' efforts to introduce serious treatment of economic issues into schooling, Rugg's attempt to make social issues the hallmark of the social studies fell prey to the conservative backlash of this era that quickly became adept at ending educational initiatives of which they disapproved by branding them "un-American."

Many new curriculum materials treated difference in a benign, if superficial, fashion, especially those associated with some branches of the intercultural education movement. The concurrence of growing awareness of the Holocaust with acknowledgement of the Japanese relocation camps in this country and ongoing problems related to race and ethnicity here at home stimulated interest in intercultural education after the war. This movement used school curriculum and extra-curricular assembly programs to spark discussion of cultural differences in American life. In social studies, those most prominently associated with this movement were Rachel Davis Dubois,[44] Hilda Taba, William Van Til, and William Kilpatrick. Educational and religious organizations such as the National Council of Christians and Jews, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and NCSS joined forces to sponsor many of these efforts, in conjunction with the Bureau for Intercultural Education.[45]

In 1945, NCSS issued its sixteenth yearbook on the subject of *Democratic Human Relations*, with Taba and Van Til as editors. Van Til was Director of Publications and Learning Materials for the Bureau for Intercultural Education and Taba, Director of the Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools' initiative of the American Council on Education. Joining them as contributor was noted Black sociologist and the first African American to be tenured at the University of Chicago, Allison Davis. Another writer for this volume was Wanda Robertson, former principal of the elementary and nursery schools at the Japanese War Relocation Center in Topaz, Utah. In relatively short order, this yearbook was reissued twice by NCSS due to high demand.

The NCSS archives indicate a high level of engagement with issues of intercultural education and growing awareness of the hypocrisy and strains in the national educational fabric due to Jim Crow. Representatives of NCSS, in fact, traveled to the South in the late forties and met with Black leaders to discuss the particular challenges of Black education in this region. NCSS endorsed the end to segregation in schooling called for by *Brown vs. Board of Education* in 1954. In the sixties and seventies, the Committee on Racism and Social Justice in NCSS sponsored "racism clinics" across the country, which relied heavily on the work of Fannie Shaftel and her role-playing techniques.[46] These efforts reflect a shift in the nature of engagement with difference from the more superficial efforts of the earlier intercultural education movement to a more politicized one.

Numerous articles about minority groups emerge in the pages of *Social Education* during the seventies, culminating in the position statement issued in 1976 by the NCSS Task Force on Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines.[47] What is notable in these materials is the degree to which they rely on a rationale for inclusion of racial/ethnic/gender material that rests on the psychological or "identity" needs of the group. Compensation, in other words, seems the order of the day for damage caused by past inequities in educational treatment, redress of which, it is believed, will help promote healthier and fuller development for those individuals as part of

American society. Such concerns produced an outpouring of books and dissertations scrutinizing the treatment of minorities and women in textbooks during this period.[48]

By the early seventies, many colleges and universities had created new departments of African American Studies, Chicano Studies, and Women's Studies, among others. High schools created new "electives" dealing with racial and ethnic minorities and began to infuse some of this material into survey courses in American history. NCSS added a committee on sexism to match the one already established on racism. Later years would label much of these efforts as "tokenism" perpetuating the "victim" status of these groups. Nevertheless, real change in how the field dealt with difference can be discerned: more coverage, more legitimacy, and more pervasive acknowledgement of the contributions of racial and ethnic groups as well as women to American life.

The Knowledge Transformation Phase, 1990 to the Present

By 1990, the proliferation in feminist and multicultural scholarship had produced new critiques of "knowledge construction" within many educational institutions. Feminist disciplinary scholars in history, anthropology, and the other social sciences provided powerful analyses of the manner in which the Western canon was gendered, introducing new concepts such as "positionality," which referred to the situated nature of all knowledge production. Multicultural scholars did the same, peeling away the Eurocentric and racist thinking undergirding Western academic knowledge.[49] In the nineties, educational theorists created postcolonial critiques of curriculum related to social studies.[50] The label adopted for this period of time, the knowledge transformation phase, reflects aspiration more than reality, as the period is still young and the accomplishments uneven. Demands for greater inclusion of difference in social studies curriculum have gained legitimacy, but the scope of change sought is greater than ever. Scholars representing the field of multicultural education seek a complete overhaul of social studies education, advocating perspective taking throughout the entire enterprise, progress in which has met serious resistance from the standards and testing movement.

Surprisingly, an important publication such as the *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* reflects few of the new curricular trends, including only indirect references to the impact of feminist thinking[51] or postmodernist influences on the field.[52] Nevertheless, slow, incremental progress in dealing with difference did occur. No longer did the rationales offered call upon cultural deficiency or social vulnerability as prominently as they had in the past. Scholars of color and others demanded change in curriculum from platforms of equity, fairness, and truth, rather than from psychological need or recompense for victimization. Prominent multicultural education scholars such as James Banks laid out a schema for thorough going knowledge transformation, essentially calling for a paradigm shift in the norms and standards used to determine what gets taught and how it is taught.[53]

In his comprehensive essay on the social studies "near century's end," Stephen J. Thornton reviews many aspects of the field's history pertinent to this essay.[54] He notes how divisive social studies scholars found debates over multiculturalism in the eighties.[55] By contrast with earlier periods, however, such debates centered less on whether multicultural content should be present in the curriculum and more on how much and on what terms, with competing approaches characterized as ranging from "additive" or "contributions" approaches to "transformative" ones.[56] Authors of educational jeremiads such as Arthur Schlesinger and Diane Ravitch argued that multicultural content was crowding out the founding fathers and other staples of American history, which would result in undermining national unity. Undoubtedly, high levels of immigration to this country since changes in immigration law in 1965 contributed to renewed alarm about assimilation in American history. Furthermore, the "youth rebellion," "sexual revolution" and Black and feminist movements of the sixties and seventies had led to the "culture wars" of the eighties and nineties, producing backlash over the aims and content of schooling.

In social studies, the most contentious battles occurred over the history standards. Stories associated with this chapter of the culture wars will not be reviewed here.[57] Suffice it to say that sociologist Nathan Glazer's book title, "We are all multiculturalists now,"[58] offers insight into the

ultimate verdict in these trials. Many academics, educational theorists, and school practitioners echoed Glazer's sentiment.[59] Social studies textbooks reflected acceptance of multiculturalism.[60] By the mid-nineties, visitors to NCSS conferences found most of the major publishers touting newly re-written textbooks with "complete" multicultural content promised in every chapter. With the spread of high-stakes testing, however, it seems likely that less multicultural content will make its way onto these tests, thus undercutting its inclusion in textbooks.

Little explicit attention to women or gender could be found in the national standards promulgated by NCSS early in the nineties.[61] It is possible that the new emphasis on multicultural education crowded out demands for coverage of women in social studies curriculum. Little coverage could also be found in the social studies of gay and lesbian issues.[62] Indeed, not until 2002 did a social studies publication address this issue as holistically as did *Theory and Research in Social Education* that year. The editor of the journal, Elizabeth Yeager, ran a special issue on sexual orientation and the social studies, featuring a number of approaches that reflected both psychological compensation as well as knowledge transformation rationales for inclusion of gay and lesbian material in social studies curriculum.[63] Within the academy, scholarship on gay and lesbian studies had grown markedly over the previous decades.[64] These innovations were matched by the initiatives of school-based educators and civil rights organizations to improve the treatment of gays and lesbians in schools and society. Belatedly, these influences were acknowledged in curriculum prescriptions for the social studies, which called for transformation in the knowledge associated with the field. As Thornton succinctly expressed it, "Does everybody count as human?"[65]

Conclusion

Over the twentieth century, changes in the way social studies curriculum has dealt with difference can clearly be identified. It is not accidental that those in positions of power to make those changes also changed to some extent. For example, in the first half of the century, only one woman gained the presidency of NCSS each decade; by the year 2000, three to four women were

Even so necessarily cursory a review as this essay should suggest that, as turf battles and curricular evolution have taken place, other battles have also been fought over matters of difference within the social studies curriculum. These battles provide prime evidence of the material and status consequences perceived to flow from distribution and re-distribution of space in the social studies curriculum and the socially and politically sensitive nature of these adjustments.[69] Each addition typically necessitated subtraction from an already overflowing curriculum.[70] Knowledge transformation became a zero-sum game that reflected, in many people's minds, consequences extending far beyond schools' walls, ones closely tied to notions of social studies curriculum as public representation of core civic values. Further investigation of the many features connected to dealing with difference in the social studies must be undertaken by other social studies scholars to fill in the gaps and test the hypotheses offered here.

How the field of social studies has dealt with racial, ethnic, and gendered differences speaks to how we, as Americans, view our national identity. Clearly, the field has come a distance from the days of Thomas Jesse Jones. Curricular reticence on matters of religion and social class reflects our identity as a secular people in the civic realm yet with strong commitments to privatized forms of religion alongside devotion to commerce and consumerism.[71] Today's social studies curriculum, in theory if not in practice, celebrates the notion that the tent shielding American society is a multicolored one, with lots of room for diverse attractions inside. If we are indeed, as sociologist Alan Wolfe suggests, "One nation after all,"[72] then it seems fitting that the social studies curriculum should both promote and reflect this new civic identity.

---

[1] Readers are encouraged to review pertinent works in the history of education, curriculum and the social studies that offer in-depth analyses of the forces shaping the field in the twentieth century. For example, Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Vintage Books, 1964); Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago:

being elected each decade. Likewise, far more women served as university professors, teacher educators, and influential spokespersons for the field than had been the case in early years. James Banks served as first African American president of NCSS in the eighties and Jesus Garcia will become the first Latino president of NCSS in 2004. Despite these milestones, growth in the number of social studies theorists, professors, and teachers of color was slow. Although matters of difference in curriculum had become commonplace, diverse practitioners seemed harder to find.

Nor has introduction of all dimensions of difference proceeded evenly across the social studies curriculum, as we have seen. Although Americans' expressions of tolerance (at least to pollsters) are impressive,[66] disagreements exist about applying aspects of difference to school curriculum, especially at the elementary level. Likewise, broaching topics related to class difference, the maldistribution of wealth in this country, and the relationship of these to capitalism remains taboo in many settings.

Goodson's theorizing about curriculum development holds for social studies. The field is, indeed, a shifting amalgamation of sub-groups and traditions. Note the tenuous position of geography, which has seen its fortunes within social studies rise and fall and rise again in recent years. The discipline of history has clamored consistently since the 1920s for more turf in social studies.[67] Today's renewed efforts by organizations such as the American Historical Association and the National Center for History Education reflect Goodson's claim that school subjects move from pedagogic and utilitarian ends to academic ones. In New York State, for example, the last few years have witnessed replacement of "global studies" with "world history and geography," aligned with standards promulgated by the World History Association and reflecting the growing prominence of this subject at the university-level. The standards movement in general reflects the demographic reality of greater attendance at college today as compared with the early twentieth century. Thus, the field of social studies has moved in a more traditional, disciplinary-oriented direction, especially at the secondary level.[68]

University of Chicago Press, 1962); David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974); Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1995); Wayne Urban and Jennings Wagoner, *American Education: A History, 2nd ed.* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2000); Paula Fass, *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education*; Stephan Brumberg, *Going to America, Going to School* (New York: Praeger, 1986); Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reform* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

[2] The issue of difference has been an ongoing concern of feminists as regards women's status in democracy: Can one be different as well as equal? See, for example, the work of Carole Pateman, Iris Marion Young, Linda Nicholson, Mary G. Dietz, and Nancy Hartsock.

[3] Michael Lybarger, "Origins of the Modern Social Studies: 1900-1916," *History of Education Quarterly* 23, no. 4 (1983): 456.

[4] I discovered Jeffrey Mirel's article, "Civic Education and Changing Definitions of American Identity, 1900-1950," *Educational Review* 54, no. 2 (2002): 143-152, towards the end of writing this article. His subject matter overlaps with that here to some degree. For example, he does not consider gender in his analysis. Nevertheless, his judgments about treatment of race and ethnicity in early twentieth century education substantially corroborate those presented here. An earlier article tackling some of these same issues is R. Freeman Butts, "Historical Perspective on Civic Education in the United States," in National Task Force on Citizenship Education, *Education for Responsible Citizenship* (NY: McGraw Hill, 1977), 27-47.

[5] Arthur N. Applebee, *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

[6] Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1995): 1.

[7] Margaret Smith Crocco and OL Davis, Jr., *"Bending the Future to Their Will": Civic Women, Social Education and Democracy* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999); Margaret Smith Crocco and OL

Davis, Jr., *Building a Legacy: Women in Social Education, 1784-1984*, NCSS Bulletin 100 (Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 2002).

[8] The most comprehensive recent history of the field is David Jenness's *Making Sense of Social Studies* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), which serves to underscore the fact that significant variation exists across states in how social studies gets enacted today.

[9] Ivor Goodson, "Aspects of a Social History of Curriculum," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 15, no. 4 (1983): 391-408.

[10] Besides Jenness, other historical works about the social studies include David Warren Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1991); Hazel Hertzberg, *Social Studies Reform, 1880-1980: A Project SPAN Report* (Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1981).

[11] Stephen J. Thornton, "Teacher as Curricular-Instructional Gatekeeper in Social Studies," in James P. Shaver, ed., *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (New York: Macmillan, 1991): 237-248.

[12] On the subject of school textbook adoption, see Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised* (New York: Little Brown, 1979); Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[13] Stephen J. Thornton, "Legitimacy in the Social Studies Curriculum," in Lyn Corno, ed., *Education Across a Century: The Centennial Volume, National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Part 1* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001): 185-205.

[14] Robert A. Carlson, *The Americanization Syndrome: A Quest for Conformity* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987); Mirel, "Civic Education and Changing Definitions of American Identity, 1900-1950;" Michael Olneck, "Americanization and the Education of Immigrants," *American Journal of Education*, 97 (1989): 398-423. Nel Noddings argues that Jane Addams's efforts to teach immigrants American ways were not forms of disrespect to old cultures, nor were they efforts to supplant the old culture with the new one: Nel Noddings, "Jane Addams, 1860-1935," in Joy A. Palmer, ed., *Fifty Major Thinkers on Education* (New York: Routledge, 2001): 182-187.

[15] I follow Herbert Kliebard's approach to progressivism within education here, noting the variety of types of progressive educators, including the social efficiency group and the social meliorist group. For more detail, see Kliebard's *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*.

[16] Stephen T. Correia, "For Their Own Good: An Historical Analysis of the Exceptional Thought of Thomas Jesse Jones" (Ph.D. diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 1993).

[17] Paula Fass, *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); see also, George Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968), especially the sections on Franz Boas.

[18] Thomas Jesse Jones, *Essentials of Civilization: A Study in Social Values* (New York: Henry Holt, 1929). Jones wrote extensively about his views on education and subsequent work in race relations both in the United States and Africa. See, for example, his small book, *Four Essentials of Education* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926) and the history of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, between 1910 and 1920, *Educational Adaptations* (New York: Phelps Stokes Fund, n.d.).

[19] Several sources treat Jones in detail; others deal with him in a more cursory fashion. Besides Correia's dissertation, see Michael Lybarger, "Origins of the Social Studies Curriculum: 1865-1916" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1981): Eric Anderson and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *Dangerous Donations: Northern Philanthropy and Southern Black Education* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999); William Watkins, *White Architects of Black Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

[20] Thomas Jesse Jones, *Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum* (Hampton, VA: Hampton Institute Press, 1908).

[21] David Angus and Jeffrey Mirel, *The Failed Promise of the American High School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999): 15.

[22] Herbert Kliebard, "'That Evil Genius of the Negro Race:' Thomas Jesse Jones and Educational Reform," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 10 (1994): 5-20; William H. Watkins, "Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies, and Race," *The International Journal of Social Education* 10 (1995-96): 124-134; Donald Johnson, "W.E.B. Dubois, "Thomas Jesse Jones and the Struggle for Social Education, 1900-30," *Journal of Negro History* 83, no. 3: 71-96.

[23] William H. Watkins, *White Architects of Black Education*.

[24] Horace Kallen, "Democracy versus the melting pot," *Nation* 100 (February 18-25, 1915): 190-94, 217-220. See also Michael Walzer's history American identity, *What It Means to Be an American* (New York: Marsilio, 1992).

[25] Crocco and Davis, *"Bending the Future to Their Will,"* 1-93.

[26] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Knopf, 1985), especially pages 53-77, where she discussed the "female world of love and ritual.".

[27] Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

[28] Micheline Fedyck, Conceptions of Citizenship and Nationality in High School American History Textbooks, 1913-1977 (Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 1979): 134, 119.

[29] Stanley P. Wronski, "Edgar Bruce Wesley (1891-1980): His Contributions to the Past, Present and Future of the Social Studies," *Journal of Thought* 17, no 3. (1982): 55-67.

[30] See, for example, Melville J. Herskovits, *Cultural Relativism: Perspectives on Cultural Pluralism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972) and Stocking, *Race, Culture and Evolution.*

[31] Fedyck, 69.

[32] Keith C. Barton, "Mary Kelty's Narratives of U.S. National History," Paper presented at the 12th Biennial Conference of the Canadian History of Education Association, Quebec City, October 26, 2002.

[33] In social studies, this emphasis can be seen in Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker's *The Child-Centered School: An Appraisal of the New Education* (Yonkers on Hudson, NY: World Book Company, 1928).

[34] Nathan Hare, "The Teaching of Black History and Culture in Secondary Schools," *Social Education* 33, no. 4 (1969): 385-390. This article is part of an issue devoted to "Black Americans and Social Studies" and "Minority Groups in American Society." The following year, an article in the journal reviews three decades of authorship, questioning the diversity within this group: June R. Chapin and Richard E. Gross, "A Barometer of the Social Studies: Three Decades of Social Education," *Social Education* 34, no 8 (1970): 788-795. Twice in the article, the authors note that this NCSS journal has traditionally reflected a "kid-gloves approach" (794) and that it has not been on the "cutting edge of change." (795).

[35] See, for example, the set of essays compiled by Howard University historian Rayford W. Logan by leading Black intellectuals, which was published under the title of *What the Negro Wants* by the University

of North Carolina Press in 1944 (reissued, with a new introduction by Kenneth Robert Janken, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 2001).

[36] Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1944).

[37] David W. Southern, *Gunnar Myrdal and Black-White Relations: The Use and Abuse of An American Dilemma, 1944-1969* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1987).

[38] See the brief biographies of Ella Baker and Septima Clark in the Crocco and Davis book, *Building a Legacy: Women Social Educators, 1784-1984*; Myles Horton, *The Long Haul: An Autobiography* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1998); Jerry Ligon and George Chilcoat, "Developing Democratic Citizens: The Mississippi Freedom Schools as a Model for Social Studies Instruction," *Theory and Research in Social Education 22*, no. 2 (1994): 128-75; Daniel Perlstein, "Teaching Freedom: SNCC and the Creation Of the Mississippi Freedom Schools," *History of Education Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (1990): 297-324; Susan F Semel and Alan R. Sadovnik, ed., *"Schools of Tomorrow," Schools of Today: What Happened to Progressive Education* (New York: Peter Lang Publishers, 1999).

[39] Margaret Smith Crocco, "Mary Ritter Beard and Marion Thompson Wright: Shaping Inclusive Social Education, "*Theory and Research in Social Education* 25, no. 1 (1997): 9-33. Margaret Smith Crocco and Cally L. Waite, "The Education of African Americans in the North." Paper presented at the History of Education Society Annual Meeting, Athens, Georgia, 1999. See, for example, Edna Colson's doctoral dissertation on Black history in school curriculum across the country, "An Analysis of the Specific References to Negroes in Selected Curricula for the Education of Teachers" (Ph.D. diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941); Doxey A. Wilkerson, "American Caste and the Social Studies Curriculum," *Quarterly Review of Higher Education among Negroes* 5, no 2 (1937): 57-83; Charles H. Wesley, "Education for Citizenship in a Democracy," *Journal of Negro Education* 10, no. 1 (1941): 68-78; Murry R. Nelson, "Merl R. Eppse and Studies of Blacks in American History Textbooks," *International Journal of Social Education* 3, no. 3 (1988): 84-91.

[40] Fedyck, 134; changes in NCSS and its publications are documented by the author in a chapter for a forthcoming book, Margaret Smith Crocco, "Women and the Social Studies: The Long Rise and Rapid Fall of Feminist Activity in the National Council for the Social Studies," in Christine Woyshner, Joseph Watras,

and Margaret Smith Crocco, eds., *Social Education for the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship* (New York: Peter Lang Publishers, forthcoming).

[41] See, by contrast, the description of the popular textbooks written by Mary Kelty for elementary schools, in Barton, "Mary Kelty's Narratives of U.S. National History."

[42] Evans, 63-73; 132; 174-78; Fedyck makes the point that melting pot theories continued to persist into seventies textbooks, but that "America's nonwhite minority groups provide many of the same authors [of textbooks] with fuel for the cultural pluralist interpretation." (p.349). A few pages later, she notes the "ethnic pride" element of many new textbooks' treatments of Indian, Chicano, and Asian Americans (p. 351).

[43] Jenness, 100-101; Zimmerman, 66-67.

[44] On Dubois and the Bureau for Intercultural Education, see Nicholas V. Montalto, *A History of the Intercultural Education Movement, 1924-1941* (New York: Garland, 1982); on Dubois' life and work, see O.L. Davis, Jr. in *"Bending the Future to Their Will":* 169-185; on Taba's life and work, see Jane Bernard-Powers in "*Bending the Future to Their Will":* 185-207, on other progressive women educators of the 20th century who grappled with intercultural issues, see Margaret Smith Crocco, Petra Munro, and Kathleen Weiler, *Pedagogies of Resistance: Women Educator Activists, 1880-1960;* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999).

[45] On the intercultural education movement and its links to multicultural education, see Cherry A. McGee Banks, "The Intergroup Education Movement," in James A. Banks, ed., *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge & Action: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), 251-277; see, too, Stewart G. Cole, I. James Quillen, Mildred J. Wise, eds., *Charting Intercultural Education 1945-1955* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1946); Howard E. Wilson, *Intergroup Relations in Teaching Materials* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1950); Hilda Taba, Elizabeth Hall Brady, John T. Robinson, *Intergroup Education in Public Schools* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1952); Jean D. Grambs, *Understanding Intergroup Relations* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1960).

[46] Papers documenting these clinics can be found in the NCSS archives in the John Jarolimek papers, and those of the Committee on Racism and Social Justice, Milbank Library, Teachers College, Columbia

University. A brief biographical essay on Fannie Shaftel is available in Crocco and Davis, eds., *Building a Legacy*, 117-118.

[47] A very partial list of the works written by social studies authors that reflect this new orientation towards cultural and gender diversity would include the following: Donald W. Oliver and Fred M. Newmann, *The Immigrant's Experience: Cultural Variety and the Melting Pot Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project* (Washington, DC: Office of Education, 1967); Hazel Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1971); James A. Banks and Jean Dresden Grambs, *Black Self-Concept* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1972); Donald W. Oliver and Fred M. Newmann, *Negro Views of America: The Legacy of Oppression, Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project* (Washington, DC: Office of Education, 1974-75). Oliver and Newmann pose the question: "In what ways can conditions in a person's environment affect his personality and his image of himself? Can government involve itself in human relations to guarantee each individual a sense of worth and self pride?" Also, James A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975); The NCSS Task Force on Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines, *Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education, Position Statement* (Washington, DC: NCSS, 1976); on women, see, for example, Janice Law Trecker, "Women in U.S. History Textbooks," *Social Education* 35, no. 3 (1971): 249-261; Elizabeth Burr, Susan Dunn, and Norma Farquhar, "Women and the Language of Inequality," *Social Education* 36 (1972): 841-46; Jean Dresden Grambs, ed., *Teaching about Women in the Social Studies: Concepts, Methods, and Materials, Bulletin 48* (Washington, DC: NCSS, 1976); Carole Hahn, "Review of Research on Sex Roles: Implications for Social Studies Research," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 6, no. 1 (1978): 73-99.

[48] Examples include Fedyck; Nathan Glazer and Reed Ueda, *Ethnic Groups in History Textbooks* (Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1983); Rupert Costo, ed., *Textbooks and the American Indian* (n.p.: American Indian Historical Society, 1970).

[49] Among the feminist challengers (only a very partial list) of the traditional Western canon in history are: Gerda Lerner, Joan Scott, Joan Kelly, Linda Kerber, Estelle Freedman, and Natalie Zemon Davis; in anthropology, Sherry Ortner, Gayle Rubin, Michelle Rosaldo, Carol Stack, Louise Lamphere, and Peggy Sanday; in multicultural studies, Henry Louis Gates, Cornel West, Hazel Carby, Patricia Hill Collins, James Banks, James Anderson, and Gloria Ladson-Billings. Other influential feminist theorists whose work

has been significant to education include Lorraine Code, Elizabeth Minnich, Nel Noddings, Peggy McIntosh, and Jane Roland Martin. In social studies, such figures include Lynda Stone, Jane Bernard-Powers, Carole Hahn, and Linda Levstik.

[50] Three exemplars of this way of thinking about global issues in curriculum are: John Willinsky, *Learning to Divide the World* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press: 1998); Nina Asher and Margaret Smith Crocco, "(En)gendering Multicultural Identities and Representations in Education," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 29, no. 1 (2001): 129-151; Merry Merryfield, ""Moving the Center of Global Education: from Imperial World Views that Divide the World to Double Consciousness, Contrapuntal Pedagogy, Hybridity, and Cross-Cultural Competence," in William B. Stanley, ed., *Critical Issues in Social Studies Research for the 21st Century* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers, 2001): 179-202; Merry Merryfield and Binaya Subedi, "A Global Education Framework for Teaching about the World's Women," in *Social Education* (forthcoming); Susan Schulten, *The Geographical Imagination in America, 1880-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

[51] Paper presented by Jane Bernard-Powers and Carole Hahn on "Gender and the Social Studies" at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of NCSS, Phoenix, Arizona, November 22, 2002.

[52] Avner Segall, "Social Studies and the Discourses of Postmodernity," in Woyshner, Watras, and Crocco, eds., *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship.*

[53] Gloria Ladson-Billings has written about "culturally relevant pedagogy," which includes what gets taught and also approaches to teaching. See her "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy," *American Educational Research Journal* 32, no.3 (1995): 465-491 and *Dreamkeepers* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1994)

[54] Stephen J. Thornton, "The Social Studies Near Century's End: Reconsidering Patterns of Curriculum and Instruction," in Linda Darling-Hammond, ed., *Review of Research in Education 20* (Washington DC: American Educational Research Association, 1994): 223-254.

[55] Catherine Cornbleth and Dexter Waugh, *The Great Speckled Bird: Multicultural Politics and Educational Policymaking* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

[56] See Banks, *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge & Action*, especially chapter 1, as well as James Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002) for thorough discussions of differing approaches to multicultural education.

[57] See Lynda Symcox, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002); and also, Gary Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past* (New York: Knopf, 1997).

[58] Nathan Glazer, *We Are All Multiculturalists Now* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997)

[59] Katharyne Mitchell, "Education for Democratic Citizenship: Transnationalism, Multiculturalism, and the Limits of Liberalism," *Harvard Educational Review* 71, no. 1 (2001): 51-79.

[60] Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America?*

[61] Asher and Crocco, "(En)gendering Multicultural Identities and Representations in Education."

[62] Thornton, 237-243.

[63] Elizabeth Yeager, ed., Special Issue: Social Education and Sexual Identity, *Theory and Research in Social Education* 30, no. 2 (2002).

[64] See, for example, Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, George Chauncey, eds., *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (New York: Meridian, 1989); Jonathan Ned Katz, *Gay American History* (New York: Meridian, 1992); Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Knopf, 1985) and the work of James Sears in education.

[65] Stephen J. Thornton, "Does Everybody Count as Human?" *Theory and Research in Social Education* 30, no. 2 (2002): 178-190.

[66] Alan Wolfe, *One Nation After All: What Middle-Class Americans Really Think About God/Country/Family/Racism/Welfare/Immigration/Homosexuality/Work/The Right/The Left and Each Other* (New York: Penguin, 1999).

[67] Jenness, 98-99.

[68] Hazel Hertzberg, *Social Studies Reform, 1880-1980*, especially pages 175-183.

[69] Zimmerman, *Whose America?* See especially Chapter Five.

[70] Margaret Smith Crocco, "Making Time for Women's History...When Your Survey Course is Already Filled to Overflowing," *Social Education* 16, no. 1 (1997): 32-37.

[71] Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Knopf, 2003).

[72] Wolfe, *One Nation After All*.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Dealing with Difference in the Social Studies: A Historical Perspective	
Author(s): Margaret Smith Crocco	
Corporate Source: AERA Annual Meeting 2003, Chicago, Illinois	Publication Date: 04/24/2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Margaret Smith Crocco	Printed Name/Position/Title: Margaret Smith Crocco	
Organization/Address: Associate Professor, Box 80, Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th St. NY, NY 10027	Telephone: (212) 678-3174	FAX: (973) 898-0021
	E-Mail Address: msc38@columbia.edu	Date: 04/29/2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)